

**EDUCATION AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT CABINET**  
**Education Professional Standards Board**  
**(Amendment)**

**16 KAR 5:010. Standards for accreditation of educator preparation providers~~[units]~~ and approval of programs.**

RELATES TO: KRS 161.028, 161.030, 164.945, 164.946, 164.947, 20 U.S.C. 1021-1022~~[h]~~  
STATUTORY AUTHORITY: KRS 161.028, 161.030

NECESSITY, FUNCTION, AND CONFORMITY: KRS 161.028(1) authorizes the Education Professional Standards Board (EPSB) to establish standards and requirements for obtaining and maintaining a teaching certificate and for programs of preparation for teachers and other professional school personnel. KRS 161.030(1) requires all certificates issued under KRS 161.010 to 161.126 to be issued in accordance with the administrative regulations of the EPSB~~[board]~~. This administrative regulation establishes the standards for accreditation of an educator preparation provider~~[unit]~~ and approval of a program to prepare an educator.

Section 1. Definitions. (1) "Accreditation Reviewers" means the evaluators who review educator preparation providers as part of the accreditation process.

(2) "Advanced programs" means educator preparation programs offered at the graduate level and designed to develop additional specialized professional skills or credentials for P-12 educators who have already completed an initial certification program.

(3) "CAEP" means the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation that establishes a set of national accreditation standards for educator preparation that apply to the state accreditation process.

(4) "Educator Preparation Provider" (EPP) means the accredited unit at an institution responsible for the preparation of educators.

(5) "Initial programs" means educator preparation programs offered at the undergraduate or graduate levels to prepare an individual for a first professional teaching credential. These programs are designed to prepare candidates who have not yet earned a certificate to become P-12 educators.

(6) "Institution" means a college or university. ~~[(4) "AACTE" means the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.]~~

~~(2) "Biennial report" means the report prepared by the EPSB summarizing the institutionally-prepared annual reports for a two (2) year period.~~

~~(3) "Board of examiners" means the team who reviews an institution on behalf of NCATE or EPSB.~~

~~(4) "EPSB" means the Education Professional Standards Board.~~

~~(5) "NCATE" means the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.~~

~~(6) "NCATE accreditation" means a process for assessing and enhancing academic and educational quality through voluntary peer review.]~~

(7) "National Specialized Professional Association" means the association that defines the content-area standards for specialized programs. EPSB approved National Specialized Professional Associations are published on the EPSB website.

(8) [(7)] "State accreditation" means recognition by the EPSB that an EPP~~[institution]~~ has~~[-a professional education unit that has]~~ met accreditation standards as a result of review, including an on-site team review.

(9) "Technical visit" means an on-campus, in-person visit by EPSB staff to an institution or EPP to advise for program and accreditation reviews.

(10) "Unit" means the college, school or department of education that is seeking a first-time EPSB accreditation.

(11) "Institutional accreditation" means the accreditation that is granted to an entire institution. This may be earned through a regional accreditor or national accreditor that is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.

Section 2. General Accreditation Requirements. (1) ~~A Kentucky~~[An] institution offering an educator ~~preparation~~[certification] program ~~shall have~~[or a program leading to a rank change]:

(a) National accreditation by an educator preparation accreditor approved by the EPSB; or

(b) State accreditation by the EPSB.

~~(a) Shall be accredited by the state; and~~

~~(b) May be accredited by NCATE.]~~

(2) State accreditation shall be based~~[:~~

~~(a) A condition of offering an educator certification program or a program leading to a rank change; and~~

~~(b) Based] on the EPSB-approved national accreditation standards aligned to the components~~[which include the program standards] enumerated in KRS 161.028(1)(b), and that~~[which] are [set out in the "Professional Standards for the Accreditation of Teacher Preparation Institutions"] established by CAEP.~~[NCATE. The accreditation standards shall include:]

(a) The 2022 CAEP Initial-Level Standards shall be the accreditation standards for EPPs offering initial teacher certification programs.

(b) The CAEP Standards for Accreditation at the Advanced Level shall be the accreditation standards for EPPs offering advanced educator preparation programs.

~~1. Standard 1 – Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions. Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other professional school personnel know and demonstrate the content, pedagogical, and professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.~~

~~2. Standard 2 – Assessment System and Unit Evaluation. The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the unit and its programs.~~

~~3. Standard 3 – Field Experience and Clinical Practice. The unit and its school partners design, implement, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice so that teacher candidates and other school personnel develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn.~~

~~4. Standard 4 – Diversity. The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and experiences for candidates to acquire and apply the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. These experiences include working with diverse higher education and school faculty, diverse candidates, and diverse students in P-12 schools.~~

~~5. Standard 5 – Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development. Faculty are qualified and model best professional practices in scholarship, service, and teaching, including the assessment of their own effectiveness as related to candidate performance; they also collaborate with colleagues in the disciplines and schools. The unit systematically evaluates faculty performance and facilitates professional development.~~

~~6. Standard 6 – Unit Governance and Resources. The unit has the leadership, authority, budget, personnel, facilities, and resources including information technology resources, for the preparation of candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards.~~

~~(3) NCATE accreditation shall not be a condition of offering an educator certification program or a program leading to a rank change.]~~

~~(3)~~(4) All educator preparation institutions and programs operating in Kentucky that require licensure by the Council on Postsecondary Education under KRS 164.945, 164.946, 164.947, and 13 KAR 1:020 shall be approved by:

~~(a) Be accredited by the state through~~ the EPSB under this administrative regulation as a condition of offering an educator preparation~~[certification]~~ program or a program leading to rank change,~~]; and~~

~~(b) Comply with the EPSB "Accreditation of Preparation Programs Procedure".]~~

(4) For continuing national or state accreditation, an EPP must submit the following evidence as part of the accreditation process:

(a) Documentation submitted to the EPSB staff for Title II compliance, indicating that the EPP's summary pass rate on state licensure examinations meets or exceeds the required state pass rate of eighty (80) percent; and

(b) Documentation of institutional accreditation. Required documentation shall include a copy of the current institutional accreditation letter or report that indicates institutional accreditation status.

Section 3. Developmental Process for New Educator Preparation Institutions~~[Programs]~~. ~~(1) Institutions~~[New educator preparation institutions] requesting approval from the EPSB to be recognized as a new EPP~~[develop educator preparation programs that do not have a historical foundation from which to show the success of candidates or graduates as required under Section 9 of this administrative regulation]~~ shall follow the four (4) stage developmental process established in this Section to gain temporary authority to admit and exit candidates and operate one (1) or more educator preparation programs. The developmental process is required whether an institution intends to seek national or state accreditation.

(2) Stage One: Application.

(a) The [educator preparation] institution shall submit to the EPSB for review and acceptance an official notice of intent~~[letter]~~ from the chief executive officer and the governing board of the institution ~~[to the EPSB for review and acceptance by the board]~~ indicating the institution's intent to begin the developmental process to become an educator preparation provider~~[establish an educator preparation program]~~.

(b) The EPSB staff shall make a technical visit to the institution.

(c) The institution shall submit the following documentation:

1. A letter from the institution's chief executive officer that designates the unit as having primary authority and responsibility for professional education programs;

2. A chart or narrative that lists all educator preparation programs to be offered by the institution, including any nontraditional and alternative programs, and shall depict:

a. The degree or award levels for each program;

b. The administrative location for each program; and

c. The structure or structures through which the unit implements its oversight of all programs;

3. If the unit's offerings include off-campus programs, a separate chart or narrative as described in subparagraph 2 of this paragraph, prepared for each location at which off-campus programs are geographically located;

4. An organizational chart of the institution that depicts the educator preparation unit and indicates the unit's relationship to other administrative units within the college or university;

5. The name and job description of the head of the unit and an assurance that the head has the authority and responsibility for the overall administration and operation of the unit;

6. The policies and procedures that guide the operations of the unit. Required documentation shall include the cover page and table of contents for codified policies, bylaws, procedures, and student handbooks;

7. The unit's processes, including a description of the quality assurance system, to regularly monitor and evaluate its operations, the quality of its offerings, the performance of candidates, and the effectiveness of its graduates;

8. Program review documentation identified in Section 18 and

9. The institutional accreditation. Required documentation shall include a copy of the current institutional accreditation letter or report that indicates institutional accreditation status.]

1. Program descriptions required by Section 11 of this administrative regulation;

2. Continuous assessment plan required by Section 11(2) of this administrative regulation;  
and

3. Fulfillment of Preconditions 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, and 9 established in Section 9 of this administrative regulation.

(d) The EPSB shall provide for a paper review of this documentation by the Reading Committee and the Continuous Assessment Review Committee.]

(d) Stage One documentation is reviewed by EPSB staff and the Program Review Committee. The Program Review Committee shall make one of the following recommendations:

1. Concerns identified and reported to the educator preparation unit for resolution; or

2. Recommendation to proceed to Stage Two.

(e) Following a recommendation from the Program Review Committee [review of the documentation], EPSB staff shall make an additional technical visit to the institution.

(3) Stage Two: On-Site visit and Accreditation Audit Committee Recommendation.

(a) Nine months prior to the scheduled on-site visit, the institution shall submit to the EPSB a written narrative self-study to describe the process and document that the unit has evaluated its practices against the EPSB approved accreditation standards. The written narrative may be supplemented by a chart, graph, diagram, table, or other similar means of presenting information and shall not exceed 100 pages in length.

(b)[(a)] A [board of examiners] team of trained reviewers identified by EPSB staff shall make a one (1) day visit to the institution to verify the self-study evidence[paper review].

(c)[(b)] The team of three shall be comprised of:

1. One (1) representative from a public postsecondary institution;

2. One (1) representative from an independent postsecondary institution; and

3. One (1) representative from a P-12 organization.[the Kentucky Education Association.]

(d)[(c)] The team shall submit a written report of its findings to the EPSB staff.

(e)[(d)] The EPSB staff shall provide a copy of the written report to the institution.

(f)[(e)] 1. The institution may submit a written rejoinder to the report within thirty (30) working days of its receipt.

2. The rejoinder may be supplemented by materials pertinent to the conclusions found in the team's report.

(g)[(f)] The Accreditation Audit Committee shall review the materials gathered during Stages One and Two and make one (1) of the following recommendations to the EPSB with regards to temporary authorization:

1. Approval;

2. Approval with conditions; or

3. Denial of approval.

(4) Stage Three: EPSB Ruling.

(a) The EPSB shall review the materials and recommendations from the Accreditation Audit Committee and make one (1) of the following determinations with regards to temporary authorization:

1. Approval;
2. Approval with conditions; or
3. Denial of approval.

(b) An institution receiving approval or approval with conditions shall:

1. Hold this temporary authorization for two (2) years; and
2. Continue the developmental process by pursuing~~[and the first]~~ accreditation ~~[process]~~ as established in this administrative regulation.

(c) An institution denied temporary authorization may reapply twelve (12) months after the EPSB's decision.

(d) During the two (2) year period of temporary authorization, the institution shall:

1. Admit and exit candidates;
2. Monitor, evaluate, and assess the academic and professional competency of candidates; and
3. Provide reports~~[Report regularly]~~ to the EPSB staff on the institution's progress as requested.

(e) During the two (2) year period of temporary authorization, the EPSB staff:

1. May schedule additional technical visits; and
2. Shall monitor progress by ~~[paper]~~ review of annual reports and~~[,]~~ admission and exit data~~[, and trend data].~~

(5) Stage Four: Initial Accreditation Visit.

(a) The institution shall pursue either national or state level accreditation ~~[host a first accreditation visit]~~ within two (2) years of the approval or approval with conditions of temporary authorization.

(b) If the institution pursues national accreditation, all~~[All]~~ further accreditation activities shall be governed by Section 4~~[9]~~ of this administrative regulation.

(c) If the institution pursues state accreditation, all further accreditation activities shall be governed by Section 6 of this administrative regulation.

Section 4. National Accreditation. (1) An EPP may pursue initial or continuing national accreditation, if the national accreditor has been approved by the EPSB as demonstrating the requirements of KRS 161.028.

(2) A national accreditor seeking EPSB approval shall apply to the EPSB and submit documentation of the following:

(a) Established rigorous standards for educator preparation that align with KRS 161.028(1)(b) and guide institutions in establishing and maintaining high quality programs that produce evidence of academic achievement and educator performance;

(b) Attestation that all accreditation standards be met in order for an educator preparation provider to obtain and maintain accredited status

(c) The scope of accreditation;

(d) The capacity for staff and resources to carry out the operations of the organization;

(e) Public dissemination of information about the accreditation status of educator preparation providers including length of a term of accreditation, reasons for awarding accreditation status, information about any deficiencies in relation to accreditation standards and policies and reasons for conditional approval or denial of accreditation;

(f) A system of quality assurance for standards, policies and procedures that is reviewed on a cyclical basis;

(g) Policies and procedures and a governance structure that support the established accreditation and decision-making processes; and,

(h) Letter(s) of support and interest from a Kentucky EPP.

(3) National accreditors approved by the EPSB shall notify the EPSB in writing of any changes to the requirements of subsection (2) of this section and shall include the rationale for the changes.

(4) If an EPP pursues initial or continuing accreditation from a national accreditor approved by the EPSB, the accreditation decision of the national accreditor shall be presented for recognition by the EPSB at the next scheduled meeting following the national accreditation decision.

(5) If the EPP is denied accreditation by the national accreditor, the EPP may seek Emergency Authorization to Operate from the EPSB as outlined in Section 5 of this administrative regulation.

(6) As part of national accreditation, an EPP's programs leading to educator certification and rank change shall be reviewed through the state program review process as established in Section 17 of this administrative regulation. Twenty-four (24) months prior to the scheduled on-site visit, the EPP shall submit programs for review in accordance with the program review section of this administrative regulation.

(7) Prior to the scheduled on-site evaluation visit, EPSB staff shall participate in the pre-visit to the institution to serve as a state consultant to the national chair.

(8) At least one (1) EPSB staff member shall be assigned as support staff and liaison during the national accreditation visit and one (1) state representative trained in the standards of the national accreditor shall serve as a member of the site visit team.

(9) To maintain continuing national accreditation, the EPP shall follow the cycle and timelines established by the national accreditor.

Section 5. Emergency Authorization to Operate (EAO). If a Kentucky EPP seeks initial or continuing national accreditation from a national accreditor approved by the EPSB and is denied accreditation, the EPP may apply for an EAO.

(2) An EAO allows the EPP to temporarily operate for one (1) year or two (2) academic terms.

(3) The EPP cannot admit new candidates during the EAO period.

(4) The application for an EAO shall be made from the EPP to the EPSB within five (5) business days of the date of the official notification by the national accreditor that the EPP was denied national accreditation.

(5) The EPSB staff will conduct a technical visit to the EPP within ten (10) business days of receipt of the request for EAO.

(6) The EPP shall submit a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) addressing all identified deficiencies from their national accreditation within fifteen (15) calendar days following the technical visit.

(7) The CAP will be reviewed by the Accreditation Audit Committee for recommendation to the EPSB for state accreditation, state accreditation with conditions, state accreditation with probation, or denial.

(8) The EPSB shall review the recommendation from the Accreditation Audit Committee at the next EPSB meeting and make the determination to grant the EPP state accreditation, state accreditation with conditions, state accreditation with probation or deny accreditation.

Section 6. State Accreditation. (1) EPPs seeking first or continuing state accreditation are on a seven-year review cycle.

(2) If an EPP held national accreditation prior, but now seeks state accreditation, the EPP would be reviewed for state accreditation in the same year as their previous national cycle.

(3) Twenty-four (24) months prior to the scheduled on-site visit, the EPP shall submit programs for review in accordance with Section 18 of this administrative regulation.

(4) Nine (9) months prior to the on-site visit the EPP shall submit a self-study document and supporting evidence that address the state accreditation standards.

(5) Assigned accreditation reviewers shall conduct an offsite review of the self-study and supporting evidence and produce a Formative Feedback Report to the EPP.[

~~Section 4. Schedule and Communications. (1) The EPSB shall send an accreditation and program approval schedule to each educator preparation institution no later than August 1 of each year. The first accreditation cycle shall provide for an on-site continuing accreditation visit at a five (5) year interval. The regular accreditation cycle shall provide for an on-site continuing accreditation visit at a seven (7) year interval.~~

~~(2) The accreditation and program approval schedule shall be directed to the official designated by the institution as the head of the educator preparation unit with a copy to the president. The head of the educator preparation unit shall disseminate the information to administrative units within the institution, including the appropriate college, school, department, and office.~~

~~(3) The EPSB shall annually place a two (2) year schedule of on-site accreditation visits for a Kentucky institution in the agenda materials and minutes of an EPSB business meeting.~~

~~(4) The EPSB shall coordinate dates for a joint state and NCATE accreditation on-site visit.~~

~~(5) At least six (6) months prior to a scheduled on-site visit, an institution seeking NCATE or state accreditation shall give public notice of the upcoming visit.~~

~~(6) The governance unit for educator preparation shall be responsible for the preparation necessary to comply with the requirements for timely submission of materials for accreditation and program approval as established in this administrative regulation.~~

~~Section 5. Annual Reports. (1)(a) Each institution shall report annually to the EPSB to provide data about:~~

~~1. Faculty and students in each approved program;~~

~~2. Progress made in addressing areas for improvement identified by its last accreditation evaluation; and~~

~~3. Major program developments in each NCATE standard.~~

~~(b)1. An institution seeking accreditation from NCATE and EPSB shall complete the Professional Educator Data System (PEDS) sponsored by AACTE and NCATE and located online at <http://www.aacte.org>. After the PEDS is submitted electronically, the institution shall print a copy of the completed report and mail it to the EPSB at 100 Airport Road, Frankfort, Kentucky 40601.~~

~~2. An institution seeking state-only accreditation shall complete the Annual State-Only Institutional Data Report online at <http://www.kyepsb.net/teacherprep/index.asp> and submit it electronically to the division contact through the EPSB Web site.~~

~~(2)(a) The EPSB shall review each institution's annual report to monitor the capacity of a unit to continue a program of high quality.~~

~~(b) The EPSB may pursue action against the unit based on data received in this report.~~

~~(3) The Accreditation Audit Committee shall submit a biennial report, based on data submitted in the annual reports, to the unit head in preparation for an on-site accreditation visit.~~

~~Section 6. Content Program Review Committee. (1)(a) The EPSB shall appoint and train a content program review committee in each of the certificate areas to provide content area expertise to EPSB staff and the Reading Committee.~~

~~(b) Nominations for the content program review committees shall be solicited from the education constituent groups listed in Section 13 of this administrative regulation.~~

~~(2)(a) A content program review committee shall review an educator preparation program to establish congruence of the program with standards of nationally-recognized specialty program associations and appropriate state performance standards.~~

~~(b) A content program review committee shall examine program content and faculty expertise.~~

~~(3) A content program review committee shall submit written comments to EPSB staff and the Reading Committee for use in the program approval process.~~

~~(4) A content program review committee shall not make any determination or decision regarding the approval or denial of a program.~~

~~Section 7. Continuous Assessment Review Committee. (1) The EPSB shall appoint and train a Continuous Assessment Review Committee to be comprised of P-12 and postsecondary faculty who have special expertise in the field of assessment.~~

~~(2) The Continuous Assessment Review Committee shall conduct a preliminary review of each institution's continuous assessment plan.~~

~~(3) The Continuous Assessment Review Committee shall meet in the spring and fall semesters of each year to analyze the continuous assessment plan for those institutions that are within one (1) year of their on-site visit.~~

~~(4) The Continuous Assessment Review Committee shall provide technical assistance to requesting institutions in the design, development, and implementation of the continuous assessment plan.~~

~~Section 8. Reading Committee. (1) The EPSB shall appoint and train a Reading Committee representative of the constituent groups to the EPSB.~~

~~(2) The Reading Committee shall conduct a preliminary review of accreditation materials, annual reports, and program review documents from an educator preparation institution for adequacy, timeliness, and conformity with the corresponding standards.~~

~~(3) For first accreditation, the Reading Committee shall:~~

~~(a) Review the preconditions documents prepared by the institution; and~~

~~(b) Send to the EPSB a preconditions report indicating whether a precondition has been satisfied by documentation. If a precondition has not been met, the institution shall be asked to revise or send additional documentation. A preconditions report stating that the preconditions have been met shall be inserted into the first section of the institutional report.~~

~~(4) For continuing accreditation and program approval, the Reading Committee shall:~~

~~(a) Determine that a submitted material meets requirements;~~

~~(b) Ask that EPSB staff resolve with the institution a discrepancy or omission in the report or program;~~

~~(c) Refer an unresolved discrepancy or omission to the on-site accreditation team for resolution; or~~

~~(d) Recommend that the evaluation and approval process be terminated as a result of a severe deficiency in the submitted material.~~

~~(5) The EPSB shall discuss a recommendation for termination with the originating institution. The institution may submit a written response which shall be presented, with the Reading~~



~~Committee comments and written accreditation and program, by EPSB staff for recommendation to the full EPSB.~~

~~Section 9. Preconditions for First Unit Accreditation. (1) Eighteen (18) months prior to the scheduled on-site visit of the evaluation team, the educator preparation institution shall submit information to the EPSB, and to NCATE if appropriate, documenting the fulfillment of the preconditions for the accreditation of the educator preparation unit, as established in subsection (2) of this section.~~

~~(2) As a precondition for experiencing an on-site first evaluation for educator preparation, the institution shall present documentation to show that the following conditions are satisfied:~~

~~(a) Precondition Number 1. The institution recognizes and identifies a professional education unit that has responsibility and authority for the preparation of teachers and other professional education personnel. Required documentation shall include:~~

~~1. A letter from the institution's chief executive officer that designates the unit as having primary authority and responsibility for professional education programs;~~

~~2. A chart or narrative that lists all professional education programs offered by the institution, including any nontraditional and alternative programs. The chart or narrative report shall depict:~~

~~a. The degree or award levels for each program;~~

~~b. The administrative location for each program; and~~

~~c. The structure or structures through which the unit implements its oversight of all programs;~~

~~3. If the unit's offerings include off-campus programs, a separate chart or narrative as described in subparagraph 2 of this paragraph, prepared for each location at which off-campus programs are geographically located; and~~

~~4. An organizational chart of the institution that depicts the professional education unit and indicates the unit's relationship to other administrative units within the college or university.~~

~~(b) Precondition Number 2. A dean, director, or chair is officially designated as head of the unit and is assigned the authority and responsibility for its overall administration and operation. The institution shall submit a job description for the head of the professional education unit.~~

~~(c) Precondition Number 3. Written policies and procedures guide the operations of the unit. Required documentation shall include cover page and table of contents for codified policies, bylaws, procedures, and student handbooks.~~

~~(d) Precondition Number 4. The unit has a well-developed conceptual framework that establishes the shared vision for a unit's efforts in preparing educators to work in P-12 schools and provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance, scholarship, service, and unit accountability. Required documentation shall include:~~

~~1. The vision and mission of the institution and the unit;~~

~~2. The unit's philosophy, purposes, and goals;~~

~~3. Knowledge bases including theories, research, the wisdom of practice, and education policies, that inform the unit's conceptual framework;~~

~~4. Candidate proficiencies aligned with the expectations in professional, state, and institutional standards; and~~

~~5. A description of the system by which the candidate proficiencies described are regularly assessed.~~

~~(e) Precondition Number 5. The unit regularly monitors and evaluates its operations, the quality of its offerings, the performance of candidates, and the effectiveness of its graduates. Required documentation shall include a description of the unit's assessment and data collec-~~

~~tion systems that support unit responses to Standards 1 and 2 established in Section 2(2)(b)1 and 2 of this administrative regulation.~~

~~(f) Precondition Number 6. The unit has published criteria for admission to and exit from all initial teacher preparation and advanced programs and can provide summary reports of candidate performance at exit. Required documentation shall include:~~

~~1. A photocopy of published documentation (e.g., from a catalog, student teaching handbook, application form, or Web page) listing the basic requirements for entry to, retention in, and completion of professional education programs offered by the institution, including any nontraditional, alternative or off-campus programs; and~~

~~2. A brief summary of candidate performance on assessments conducted for admission into programs and exit from them. This summary shall include:~~

~~a. The portion of Title II documentation related to candidate admission and completion that was prepared for the state; and~~

~~b. A compilation of results on the unit's own assessments.~~

~~(g) Precondition Number 7. The unit's programs are approved by the appropriate state agency or agencies and the unit's summary pass rate meets or exceeds the required state pass rate of eighty (80) percent. Required documentation shall include:~~

~~1. The most recent approval letters from the EPSB and CPE, including or appended by a list of approved programs. If any program is not approved, the unit shall provide a statement that it is not currently accepting new applicants into the nonapproved program or programs. For programs that are approved with qualifications or are pending approval, the unit shall describe how it will bring the program or programs into compliance; and~~

~~2. Documentation submitted to the state for Title II, indicating that the unit's summary pass rate on state licensure examinations meets or exceeds the required state pass rate of eighty (80) percent. If the required state pass rate is not evident on this documentation, it shall be provided on a separate page.~~

~~(h) Precondition Number 8. If the institution has chosen to pursue dual accreditation from both the state and NCATE and receive national recognition for a program or programs, the institution shall submit its programs for both state and national review.~~

~~(i) Precondition Number 9. The institution is accredited, without probation or an equivalent status, by the appropriate regional institutional accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Department of Education. Required documentation shall include a copy of the current regional accreditation letter or report that indicates institutional accreditation status.~~

~~Section 10. Institutional Report. (1) For a first accreditation visit, the educator preparation unit shall submit, two (2) months prior to the scheduled on-site visit, a written narrative describing the unit's conceptual framework and evidence that demonstrates the six (6) standards are met. The written narrative may be supplemented by a chart, graph, diagram, table, or other similar means of presenting information. The institutional report, including appendices, shall not exceed 100 pages in length. The report shall be submitted to the EPSB and to NCATE, if appropriate.~~

~~(2) For a continuing accreditation visit, the educator preparation unit shall submit, two (2) months prior to the scheduled on-site visit, a report not to exceed 100 pages addressing changes at the institution that have occurred since the last accreditation visit, a description of the unit's conceptual framework, and evidence that demonstrates that the six (6) standards are met. The narrative shall describe how changes relate to an accreditation standard and the results of the continuous assessment process, including program evaluation. The report shall be submitted to the EPSB and to NCATE, if appropriate.~~

~~Section 11. Program Review Documents. Eighteen (18) months for first accreditation and twelve (12) months for continuing accreditation in advance of the scheduled on-site evaluation visit, the educator preparation unit shall prepare and submit to the EPSB for each separate program of educator preparation for which the institution is seeking approval a concise description which shall provide the following information:~~

- ~~(1) The unit's conceptual framework for the preparation of school personnel which includes:
  - ~~(a) The mission of the institution and unit;~~
  - ~~(b) The unit's philosophy, purposes, professional commitments, and dispositions;~~
  - ~~(c) Knowledge bases, including theories, research, the wisdom of practice, and education policies;~~
  - ~~(d) Performance expectations for candidates, aligning the expectations with professional, state, and institutional standards; and~~
  - ~~(e) The system by which candidate performance is regularly assessed;~~~~
- ~~(2) The unit's continuous assessment plan that provides:
  - ~~(a) An overview of how the unit will implement continuous assessment to assure support and integration of the unit's conceptual framework;~~
  - ~~(b) Each candidate's mastery of content prior to exit from the program, incorporating the assessment of the appropriate performance standards;~~
  - ~~(c) Assessment of the program that includes specific procedures used to provide feedback and make recommendations to the program and unit; and~~
  - ~~(d) A monitoring plan for candidates from admission to exit;~~~~
- ~~(3) Program experiences including the relationship among the program's courses and experiences, content standards of the relevant national specialty program associations (e.g., National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, National Council for the Social Studies, The Council for Exceptional Children, North American Association for Environmental Education, etc.), student academic expectations as established in 703 KAR 4:060, and relevant state performance standards established in 16 KAR 1:010 or incorporated by reference into this administrative regulation including:
  - ~~(a) NCATE Unit Standards established in Section 2(2)(b) of this administrative regulation;~~
  - ~~(b) Kentucky's Safety Educator Standards for Preparation and Certification;~~
  - ~~(c) National Association of School Psychologists, Standards for School Psychology Training Programs, Field Placement Programs, Credentialing Standards; and~~
  - ~~(d) Kentucky's Standards for Guidance Counseling Programs;~~~~
- ~~(4)
  - ~~(a) Identification of how the program integrates the unit's continuous assessment to assure each candidate's mastery, prior to exit from the program, of content of the academic discipline, and state performance standards as established in 16 KAR 1:010; and~~
  - ~~(b) Identification of how the program utilizes performance assessment to assure that each candidate's professional growth is consistent with the Kentucky Teacher Standards as established in 16 KAR 1:010;~~~~
- ~~(5) A list of faculty responsible for and involved with the conduct of the specific program, along with the highest degree of each, responsibilities for the program, and status of employment within the unit and the university; and~~
- ~~(6) A curriculum guide sheet or contract provided to each candidate before or at the time of admittance to the program.~~

~~Section 12. Teacher Leader Master's Programs and Planned Fifth-Year Programs for Rank II. (1) All master's programs for rank change or planned fifth-year program for Rank II approved or accredited by the EPSB prior to May 31, 2008 shall no longer be approved or accredited as of December 31, 2010.~~

~~(a) Master's programs for initial certification shall be exempt from the requirements of this section.~~

~~(b) A master's program or planned fifth-year program for Rank II approved by the EPSB prior to May 31, 2008 shall cease admitting new candidates after December 31, 2010.~~

~~(c) Candidates admitted to a master's program or planned fifth-year program for Rank II approved by the EPSB prior to May 31, 2008 shall complete the program by January 31, 2013.~~

~~(d) An institution of higher learning with a master's program or a planned fifth-year program for Rank II approved by the EPSB prior to May 31, 2008 may submit a redesigned program for approval pursuant to the requirements of subsection (2) of this section beginning May 31, 2008.~~

~~(e) An institution may become operational beginning January 1, 2009, if the institution:~~

~~1. Submits a redesigned master's program or a planned fifth-year program for Rank II for review pursuant to the requirements of subsection (2) of this section; and~~

~~2. Receives approval of the redesigned program by the EPSB pursuant to Section 22 of this administrative regulation.~~

~~(f) 1. The EPSB shall appoint a Master's Redesign Review Committee to conduct reviews of redesigned master's programs and planned fifth-year programs for Rank II submitted for approval after May 31, 2008.~~

~~2. A master's program or a planned fifth-year program for Rank II submitted for approval after May 31, 2008 shall not be reviewed by the Continuous Assessment Review Committee, Content Program Review Committee, or the Reading Committee prior to presentation to the EPSB pursuant to Section 22(2) of this administrative regulation, but shall be reviewed by the Master's Redesign Review Committee.~~

~~3.a. After review of a master's program or planned fifth-year program for Rank II, the Master's Redesign Review Committee shall issue one (1) of the following recommendations to the Educational Professional Standards Board:~~

~~(i) Approval;~~

~~(ii) Approval with conditions; or~~

~~(iii) Denial of approval.~~

~~b. The EPSB shall consider recommendations from staff and the Master's Redesign Review Committee and shall issue a decision pursuant to Section 22(4) of this administrative regulation.~~

~~(2) Beginning May 31, 2008, the educator preparation unit shall prepare and submit to the EPSB for each separate master's program or planned fifth-year program for Rank II for which the institution is seeking approval a concise description which shall provide the following information:~~

~~(a) Program design components which shall include the following descriptions and documentation of:~~

~~1. The unit's plan to collaborate with school districts to design courses, professional development, and job-embedded professional experiences that involve teachers at the elementary, middle, and secondary levels;~~

~~2. The unit's collaboration plan with the institution's Arts and Science faculty to meet the academic and course accessibility needs of candidates;~~

~~3. The unit's process to individualize a program to meet the candidate's professional growth or improvement plan;~~

~~4. The unit's method to incorporate interpretation and analysis of annual P-12 student achievement data into the program; and~~

~~5. The institution's plan to facilitate direct service to the collaborating school districts by education faculty members;~~

~~(b) Program curriculum that shall include core component courses designed to prepare candidates to:~~

- ~~1. Be leaders in their schools and districts;~~
- ~~2. Evaluate high-quality research on student learning and college readiness;~~
- ~~3. Deliver differentiated instruction for P-12 students based on continuous assessment of student learning and classroom management;~~
- ~~4. Gain expertise in content knowledge, as applicable;~~
- ~~5. Incorporate reflections that inform best practice in preparing P-12 students for postsecondary opportunities;~~
- ~~6. Support P-12 student achievement in diverse settings;~~
- ~~7. Enhance instructional design utilizing the Program of Studies, Core Content for Assessment, and college readiness standards;~~
- ~~8. Provide evidence of candidate mastery of Kentucky Teacher Standards utilizing advanced level performances and Specialized Professional Associations (SPA) Standards if applicable; and~~
- ~~9. Design and conduct professionally relevant research projects; and~~

~~(c) The unit's continuous assessment plan that includes, in addition to the requirements of Section 11(2) of this administrative regulation:~~

- ~~1. Instruments to document and evaluate candidate ability to demonstrate impact on P-12 student learning;~~
- ~~2. Clinical experiences and performance activities; and~~
- ~~3. A description of a culminating performance-based assessment.~~

~~(3)(a) A master's program for rank change approved pursuant to this section shall be known as a Teacher Leader Master's Program.~~

~~(b) Upon completion of a Teacher Leader Master's Program and recommendation of the institution, a candidate may apply to the EPSB for a Teacher Leader endorsement.~~

~~(c)1. An institution with an approved Teacher Leader Master's Program may establish an endorsement program of teacher leadership coursework for any candidate who received a Master's degree at an out of state institution or who received a master's degree from a Kentucky program approved prior to May 31, 2008.~~

~~2. Upon completion of the teacher leadership course work and recommendation of the institution, a candidate who has received a master's degree at an out of state institution or a master's degree from a Kentucky program approved prior to May 31, 2008, may apply to the EPSB for a Teacher Leader endorsement.~~

Section 7[13]. Accreditation Reviewers[Board of Examiners]. (1) Accreditation Reviewers[A Board of Examiners] shall be comprised of:[:

~~(a) Be [recruited and appointed by the EPSB. The board shall be comprised of an equal number of] representatives from three (3) constituent groups:]~~

~~(a)[1.] Teacher educators;~~

~~(b)[2.] P-12 teachers and administrators; and~~

~~(c)[3.] State and local policymaker groups.]; and~~

~~(b) Include at least thirty-six (36) members representing the following constituencies:~~

- ~~1. Kentucky Education Association, at least ten (10) members;~~
- ~~2. Kentucky Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, at least ten (10) members; and~~
- ~~3. At least ten (10) members nominated by as many of the following groups as may wish to submit a nomination:~~

~~a. Kentucky Association of School Administrators;~~

~~b. Persons holding positions in occupational education;~~

- c. ~~Kentucky Branch National Congress of Parents and Teachers;~~
- d. ~~Kentucky School Boards Association;~~
- e. ~~Kentucky Association of School Councils;~~
- f. ~~Kentucky Board of Education;~~
- g. ~~Kentucky affiliation of a national specialty program association;~~
- h. ~~Prichard Committee for Academic Excellence;~~
- i. ~~Partnership for Kentucky Schools; and~~
- j. ~~Subject area specialists in the Kentucky Department of Education.~~

~~(2) An appointment shall be for a period of four (4) years. A member may serve an additional term if renominated and reappointed in the manner prescribed for membership. A vacancy shall be filled by the EPSB as it occurs.~~

~~(3) A member of the Board of Examiners and a staff member of the EPSB responsible for educator preparation and approval of an educator preparation program shall be trained by NCATE or trained in an NCATE-approved state program.]~~

~~(2) Accreditation reviewers shall be trained on the CAEP accreditation standards.~~

~~(3)[(4)] The EPSB staff shall select and appoint for each scheduled on-site accreditation a team of Accreditation Reviewers[examiners] giving consideration to the number and type of programs offered by the institution. [Team appointments shall be made at the beginning of the academic year for each scheduled evaluation visit. A replacement shall be made as needed.~~

~~(5) For an institution seeking NCATE accreditation, the EPSB and NCATE shall arrange for the joint Board of Examiners to co-chaired be by an NCATE appointed team member and a state team chair appointed by the EPSB.~~

~~(a) The joint Board of Examiners shall be composed of a majority of NCATE appointees in the following proportions, respectively: NCATE and state—six (6) and five (5), five (5) and four (4), four (4) and three (3), three (3) and two (2).~~

~~(b) The size of the Board of Examiners shall depend upon the size of the institution and the number of programs to be evaluated.~~

~~(5) The[(6) For an institution seeking state-only accreditation, the] EPSB staff shall identify[appoint] a chair for the team.[from a pool of trained Board of Examiners members.~~

~~(7) For state-only accreditation, the Board of Examiners shall have six (6) members.~~

~~(8) The EPSB shall make arrangements for the release time of a Board of Examiner member from his or her place of employment for an accreditation visit.~~

~~Section 14. Assembly of Records and Files for the Evaluation Team. For convenient access, the institution shall assemble, or make available, records and files of written materials which supplement the institutional report and which may serve as further documentation. The records and files shall include:~~

- ~~(1) The faculty handbook;~~
- ~~(2) Agenda, list of participants, and products of a meeting, workshop, or training session related to a curriculum and governance group impacting professional education;~~
- ~~(3) Faculty vitae or resumes;~~
- ~~(4) A random sample of graduates' transcripts;~~
- ~~(5) Conceptual framework documents;~~
- ~~(6) A curriculum program, rejoinder, or specialty group response that was submitted as a part of the program review process;~~
- ~~(7) Course syllabi;~~
- ~~(8) Policies, criteria, and student records related to admission and retention;~~
- ~~(9) Samples of students' portfolios and other performance assessments;~~

- ~~(10) Record of performance assessments of candidate progress and summary of results including a program change based on continuous assessment;~~
- ~~(11) Student evaluations, including student teaching and internship performance; and~~
- ~~(12) Data on performance of graduates, including results of state licensing examinations and job placement rates.]~~

Section ~~8~~<sup>15</sup>. State Accreditation Previsit to the Institution. No later than one (1) month prior to the scheduled on-site evaluation visit, the EPSB staff and team chair shall conduct a pre-visit to the institution to make a final review of the arrangements.~~[ For an NCATE-accredited institution, the previsit shall be coordinated with NCATE.]~~

Section ~~9~~<sup>16</sup>. State On-site Accreditation Visit. (1) At least one (1) staff member of the EPSB shall be assigned as support staff and liaison during the accreditation visit.

(2) The educator preparation institution shall reimburse a state team member for travel, lodging, and meals in accordance with 200 KAR 2:006. ~~[A team member representing NCATE shall be reimbursed by the educator preparation institution.]~~

(3) The Accreditation Reviewers~~[evaluation team]~~ shall conduct an on-site evaluation of the self-study materials prepared by the institution and seek out additional information, as needed, to make a determination as to whether the standards were met for the accreditation of the institution's educator preparation unit and for the approval of an individual educator preparation program.~~[ The evaluation team shall make use of the analyses prepared through the preliminary review process.]~~

(4)(a) An off-campus site ~~that~~<sup>which</sup> offers a self-standing program shall require a team review. If additional team time is required for visiting an off-campus site, the team chair, the institution, and the EPSB shall negotiate special arrangements.

(b) Off-campus programs shall be:

1. Considered as part of the unit and the unit shall be accredited, not the off-campus programs; and

2. Approved in accordance with Section ~~23~~<sup>28</sup> of this administrative regulation.

(5) Accreditation reviewers shall recommend findings on each of the accreditation standards~~[In a joint team, all Board of Examiners members shall vote on whether the educator preparation institution has met the six (6) NCATE standards.]~~ A recommendation~~[determination]~~ about each standard shall be limited to the following options:

(a) Met;

(b) Met, with one (1) or more defined areas for improvement; or

(c) Not met.

(6)(a) The Accreditation Reviewers~~[Board of Examiners]~~ shall review each program and cite the areas for improvement for each, if applicable.

(b) The Accreditation Reviewers~~[Board of Examiners]~~ shall define the areas for improvement in its report.

(7) The EPP may submit within thirty (30) working days of receipt of the report a written rejoinder that may be supplemented by materials pertinent to a conclusion found in the evaluation report.

(a) The accreditation documentation shall be provided for review by the Accreditation Audit Committee and EPSB.

(b) An unmet standard or area of improvement cited by the team may be recommended for change or removal by the Accreditation Audit Committee or by the EPSB because of evidence presented in the rejoinder.

~~(7) The processes established in subsections (5) and (6) of this section shall be the same for first and continuing accreditation.~~

~~(8) The on-site evaluation process shall end with a brief oral report:~~

~~(a) By the NCATE team chair and state team chair for a joint state/NCATE visit; or~~

~~(b) By the state team chair for a state-only visit.~~

~~Section 17. Preparation and Distribution of the Evaluation Report. (1) For a state-only visit, the evaluation report shall be prepared and distributed as required by this subsection.~~

~~(a) The EPSB staff shall collect the written evaluation pages from each Board of Examiners member before leaving the institution.~~

~~(b) The first draft shall be typed and distributed to Board of Examiners members.~~

~~(c) A revision shall be consolidated by the Board of Examiners chair who shall send the next draft to the unit head to review for factual accuracy.~~

~~(d) The unit head shall submit written notification to the EPSB confirming receipt of the draft.~~

~~(e) The unit head shall submit to the EPSB and Board of Examiners chair within ten (10) working days either:~~

~~1. A written correction to the factual information contained in the report; or~~

~~2. Written notification that the unit head has reviewed the draft and found no factual errors.~~

~~(f) The Board of Examiners chair shall submit the final report to the EPSB and a copy to each member of the Board of Examiners.~~

~~(g) The final report shall be printed by the EPSB and sent to the institution and to the Board of Examiners members within thirty (30) to sixty (60) working days of the conclusion of the on-site visit.~~

~~(2) For a joint state/NCATE visit, the evaluation report shall be prepared and distributed as required by this subsection.~~

~~(a) The NCATE chair shall be responsible for the preparation, editing and corrections to the NCATE report.~~

~~(b) The state chair shall be responsible for the preparation, editing and corrections of the state report in the same manner established in subsection (1) of this section for a state-only visit.~~

~~(c) The EPSB Board of Examiners report for state/NCATE continuing accreditation visits shall be prepared in accordance with the format prescribed by NCATE for State/NCATE accreditation visits and available on its Web site at <http://www.ncate.org/boe/boeResources.asp>.~~

~~Section 18. Institutional Response to the Evaluation Report. (1)(a) The institution shall acknowledge receipt of the evaluation report within thirty (30) working days of receipt of the report.~~

~~(b) If desired, the institution shall submit within thirty (30) working days of receipt of the report a written rejoinder to the report which may be supplemented by materials pertinent to a conclusion found in the evaluation report.~~

~~(c) The rejoinder and the Board of Examiners report shall be the primary documents reviewed by the Accreditation Audit Committee and EPSB.~~

~~(d) An unmet standard or area of improvement statement cited by the team may be recommended for change or removal by the Accreditation Audit Committee or by the EPSB because of evidence presented in the rejoinder. The Accreditation Audit Committee or the EPSB shall not be bound by the Board of Examiners decision and may reach a conclusion different from the Board of Examiners or NCATE.~~

~~(2) If a follow-up report is prescribed through accreditation with conditions, the institution shall follow the instructions that are provided with the follow-up report.~~



~~(3) If the institution chooses to appeal a part of the evaluation results, the procedure established in Section 24 of this administrative regulation shall be followed.~~

~~(4) The institution shall make an annual report relating to the unit for educator preparation and relating to the programs of preparation as required by Section 5 of this administrative regulation.]~~

Section ~~10~~[19]. Accreditation Audit Committee. (1) The Accreditation Audit Committee shall be a committee of the EPSB, and shall report to the full EPSB. The EPSB shall appoint the Accreditation Audit Committee as follows:

(a) One (1) lay member;

(b) ~~Two (2)~~[~~One (1)~~] classroom ~~teachers~~[~~teacher~~, appointed from nominees provided by the Kentucky Education Association];

(c) ~~Four (4)~~ EPP[~~Two (2) teacher education~~] representatives, ~~two (2)~~[~~one (1)~~] from a state-supported institution and ~~two (2)~~[~~one (1)~~] from an independent educator preparation institution, appointed from nominees provided by the Kentucky Association of Colleges for Teacher Education; and

(d) ~~One (1)~~[~~Two (2)~~] school ~~administrator~~ [~~administrators~~ appointed from nominees provided by the Kentucky Association of School Administrators.]

(2) The ~~chair~~[~~chairperson~~] of the EPSB shall designate a member of the Accreditation Audit Committee to serve as its ~~chair~~[~~chairperson~~].

(3) An appointment shall be for a period of four (4) years except that three (3) of the initial appointments shall be for a two (2) year term. A member may serve an additional term if re-nominated and reappointed in the manner established for membership. A vacancy shall be filled as it occurs in a manner consistent with the provisions for initial appointment.[]

~~(4) A member of the Accreditation Audit Committee shall be trained by NCATE or in NCATE-approved training.]~~

~~(4)~~[~~5~~] Following an on-site accreditation visit, the Accreditation Audit Committee shall review the reports and materials constituting an institutional self-study, the report of the accreditation reviewers[~~evaluation team~~], and the institutional response to the evaluation report. The committee shall then prepare a recommendation for consideration by the EPSB.

(a) The committee shall review procedures of the Accreditation Reviewers[~~Board of Examiners~~] to determine whether approved accreditation guidelines were followed.

(b) For each institution, the committee shall make a recommendation with respect to the accreditation of the institutional unit for educator preparation as well as for approval of the individual programs of preparation.

(c) For first accreditation, one (1) of four (4) recommendations shall be made:

1. Accreditation;

2. Provisional accreditation with conditions;

3. Provisional Accreditation with probation[~~Denial of accreditation~~]; or

4. Denial[~~Revocation~~] of accreditation.

(d) For regular continuing accreditation, one (1) of four (4) recommendations shall be made:

1. Accreditation;

2. Accreditation with conditions;

3. Accreditation with probation; or

4. Revocation of accreditation.[]

~~(6) For both first and continuing accreditation, the Accreditation Audit Committee shall review each program report including a report from the Reading Committee, Board of Examiners team, and institutional response and shall make one (1) of three (3) recommendations for each individual preparation program to the EPSB:~~

- (a) Approval;
- (b) Approval with conditions; or
- (c) Denial of approval.]

(5) The Accreditation Reviewers~~[(7) The Board of Examiners]~~ Team Chair may write a separate response to the recommendation of the Accreditation Audit Committee~~[Committee's]~~ if the Accreditation Audit Committee's~~[Committee]~~ decision differs from the Accreditation Reviewer's~~[Board of Examiners']~~ evaluation report.].

~~(8) The Accreditation Audit Committee shall compile accreditation data and information for each Kentucky institution that prepares school personnel. It shall prepare for the EPSB reports and recommendations regarding accreditation standards and procedures as needed to improve the accreditation process and the preparation of school personnel.]~~

Section 11[20]. Official State Accreditation Action by the EPSB~~[Education Professional Standards Board]~~. (1) A recommendation from the Accreditation Audit Committee shall be presented to the full EPSB.

(2) The EPSB shall consider the findings and recommendations of the Accreditation Audit Committee and make a final determination regarding the state accreditation of the EPP~~[educator preparation unit]~~.

(3) Decision options following a first accreditation visit shall be "accreditation", "provisional accreditation with conditions", "provisional accreditation with probation", or "denial of accreditation"~~[, or "revocation of accreditation"]~~.

(a) Accreditation.

1. This accreditation decision indicates that the EPP~~[unit]~~ meets each of the ~~[six (6) NCATE]~~ standards for ~~[unit]~~ accreditation. Areas for improvement may be cited, indicating problems warranting the institution's attention. In its subsequent annual reports, the educator preparation~~[professional education]~~ unit shall be expected to describe progress made in addressing the areas for improvement cited in the EPSB's action report.

2. The next on-site visit shall be scheduled seven~~[five (5)]~~ years following the semester of the visit.

(b) Provisional accreditation with conditions.

1. This accreditation decision indicates that the EPP~~[unit]~~ has three (3) or more areas for improvement within one (1) standard or multiple areas for improvement across multiple standards~~[not met one (1) or more of the NCATE standards.]~~ The EPP~~[unit]~~ has accredited status but shall satisfy conditions~~[provisions]~~ by providing evidence of addressing each area for improvement~~[meeting each previously unmet standard]~~. The EPSB shall require submission of documentation that addresses the areas for improvement~~[unmet standard or standards]~~ within six (6) months of the accreditation decision. Following the review of the documentation, the EPSB shall decide to~~[, or shall schedule a visit focused on the unmet standard or standards within two (2) years of the semester that the provisional accreditation decision was granted. If the EPSB decides to require submission of documentation, the institution may choose to waive that option in favor of the focused visit within two (2) years. Following the focused visit, the EPSB shall decide to:~~

- a. Accredit; ~~[or]~~
- b. Provisionally accredit with probation; or
- c. Deny accreditation.
- ~~b. Revoke accreditation.]~~

2. If the EPP~~[unit]~~ is accredited, the next on-site visit shall be scheduled for seven (7)~~[five (5)]~~ years following the semester of the first accreditation visit.

(c) Provisional Accreditation with Probation.

1. This accreditation decision indicates that the EPP has not met one (1) or more of the accreditation standards. The EPP has accredited status but is on probation. The EPP shall schedule an on-site visit within two (2) years of the semester in which the provisional probationary decision was rendered. The EPP as part of this visit shall address the unmet standard and the identified areas for improvement. Following the on-site review, the EPSB shall decide to:

- a. Accredit; or
- b. Deny accreditation.

2. If the EPP is accredited, the next on-site visit shall be scheduled for seven (7) years following the semester of the first accreditation visit.

(d)[(e)] Denial of accreditation. This accreditation decision indicates that the EPP[unit] does not meet two (2)[one (1)] or more of the [NCATE] standards, and has pervasive problems that limit its capacity to offer quality programs that adequately prepare candidates.[

(d) Revocation of accreditation. This accreditation decision indicates that the unit has not sufficiently addressed the unmet standard or standards following a focused visit.]

(4) Decision options following a continuing accreditation visit shall be "accreditation", "accreditation with conditions", "accreditation with probation", or "revocation of accreditation".

(a) Accreditation.

1. This accreditation decision indicates that the EPP[unit] meets each of the [six (6) NCATE] standards for [unit] accreditation. Areas for improvement may be cited, indicating problems warranting the EPPs[institution's] attention. In its subsequent annual reports, the EPP[professional education unit] shall [be expected to] describe progress made in addressing the areas for improvement cited in EPSB's action report.

2. The next on-site visit shall be scheduled for seven (7) years following the semester of the visit.

(b) Accreditation with conditions.

1. This accreditation decision indicates that the EPP[unit] has met all standards, but has three (3) or more areas of improvement within[not met] one (1) standard or multiple areas for improvement across multiple accreditation[or more of the NCATE] standards. If the EPSB renders this decision, the EPP[unit] shall maintain its accredited status, but shall satisfy conditions by addressing each area for improvement in a written report[meeting previously unmet standards]. EPSB shall require submission of documentation that addresses the areas for improvement[unmet standard or standards] within six (6) months of the decision to accredit with conditions[, or shall schedule a visit focused on the unmet standard or standards within two (2) years of the semester that the accreditation with conditions decision was granted. If the EPSB decides to require submission of documentation, the institution may choose to waive that option in favor of the focused visit within two (2) years]. Following the review of the documentation[focused visit], the EPSB shall decide to:

- a. Continue accreditation; [or]
- b. Continue accreditation with probation; or
- c.[b.] Revoke accreditation.

2. If the EPSB renders the decision to continue accreditation, the next on-site visit shall be scheduled for seven (7) years following the semester in which the continuing accreditation visit occurred.

(c) Accreditation with probation.

1. This accreditation decision indicates that the EPP[unit] has not met one (1) or more of the accreditation[NCATE] standards and has pervasive problems that limit its capacity to offer quality programs that adequately prepare candidates. As a result of the continuing accreditation review, the EPSB has determined that areas for improvement with respect to standards

may place an institution's accreditation in jeopardy if left uncorrected. The EPP[institution] shall schedule an on-site visit within two (2) years of the semester in which the probationary decision was rendered. The EPSB Staff shall schedule a visit focused on the unmet standard or standards within two (2) years of the semester that the accreditation with probation decision was granted.~~[This visit shall mirror the process for first accreditation. The unit as part of this visit shall address all NCATE standards in effect at the time of the probationary review at the two (2) year point.]~~ Following the on-site review, the EPSB shall decide to:

- a. Continue accreditation; or
- b. Revoke accreditation.

2. If accreditation is continued, the next on-site visit shall be scheduled for seven (7)~~[five (5)]~~ years after the semester of the continuing accreditation~~[probationary]~~ visit.

(d) Revocation of accreditation. This decision follows a probationary~~[Following a comprehensive site] visit and[that occurs as a result of an EPSB decision to accredit with probation or to accredit with conditions, this accreditation decision]~~ indicates that the EPP[unit] does not meet one (1) or more of the accreditation~~[NCATE]~~ standards, and has pervasive problems that limit its capacity to offer quality programs that adequately prepare candidates. Accreditation shall be revoked if the unit:

1. No longer meets requirements of~~[preconditions to]~~ accreditation, such as loss of state program approval, national accreditation for educator preparation, or insitutional~~[regional]~~ accreditation;

2. Misrepresents its accreditation status to the public;

3. Falsely reports data or plagiarized information submitted for accreditation and program review purposes; or

4. Fails to submit annual reports or other documents required for accreditation and program review.

(5) Notification of the EPSB action to revoke continuing accreditation or deny first accreditation~~[, including failure to remove conditions,]~~ shall include notice that:

(a) The EPP[institution] shall inform candidates~~[students]~~ currently admitted to a certification or rank program of the following:

1. A candidate~~[student]~~ recommended for certification or advancement in rank within the twelve (12) months immediately following the denial or revocation of state accreditation and who applies to the EPSB within the fifteen (15) months immediately following the denial or revocation of state accreditation shall receive the certificate or advancement in rank; and

2. A candidate~~[student]~~ who does not meet the criteria established in subparagraph 1. of this paragraph shall transfer to an EPSB~~[a state]~~ accredited EPP~~[education preparation unit]~~ in order to receive the certificate or advancement in rank~~[; and]~~

(b) An institution for which the EPSB has denied or revoked accreditation may~~[shall]~~ seek national or state accreditation. For state accreditation, the~~[ through completion of the first accreditation process. The]~~ on-site accreditation visit shall be scheduled by the EPSB no earlier than two (2) years following the EPSB action to revoke or deny state accreditation. During this two (2) year period, candidates may not be admitted to any educator preparation program.

Section 12~~[24]~~. Revocation for Cause. (1) If an area of concern or an allegation of misconduct arises ~~[in]~~ between accreditation visits, staff shall bring a complaint to the EPSB for initial review.

(2) After review of the allegations in the complaint, the EPSB may change the accreditation status of the EPP or refer the matter to the Accreditation Audit Committee for further investigation.

(3)(a) Notice of the EPSB's decision to refer the matter and the complaint shall be sent to the EPP[institution.]

(b) Within thirty (30) days of receipt of the complaint, the EPP[institution] shall respond to the allegations in writing and provide evidence pertaining to the allegations in the complaint to the EPSB.

(4)(a) The Accreditation Audit Committee shall review any evidence supporting the allegations and any information provided by the EPP[institution].

(b) Upon completion of the review, the Accreditation Audit Committee shall issue a report containing one (1) of the following four (4) recommendations to the EPSB:

1. Accreditation;
2. Accreditation with conditions;
3. Accreditation with probation; or
4. Revocation of accreditation.

(5) The EPP[institution] shall receive a copy of the Accreditation Audit Committee's report and may file a response to the Accreditation Audit Committee's recommendation.

(6)(a) The recommendation from the Accreditation Audit Committee and the EPP's[institution's] response shall be presented to the EPSB.

(b) The EPSB shall consider the findings and recommendations of the Accreditation Audit Committee and make a final determination regarding the accreditation of the EPP[educator preparation unit].

~~Section 22. Program Approval Action Outside the First or Regular Continuing Accreditation Cycle. (1) Approval of a program shall be through the program process established in Section 11 of this administrative regulation except that a new program not submitted during the regular accreditation cycle or a program substantially revised since submission during the accreditation process shall be submitted for approval by the EPSB prior to admission of a student to the program.~~

~~(2) For a new or substantially revised program, the EPSB shall consider a recommendation by staff, including review by the Continuous Assessment Review Committee, Content Program Review Committee, and the Reading Committee.~~

~~(3) A recommendation made pursuant to subsection (2) of this section shall be presented to the full EPSB.~~

~~(4) Program approval decision options shall be:~~

~~(a) Approval, with the next review scheduled during the regular accreditation cycle unless a subsequent substantial revision is made;~~

~~(b) Approval with conditions, with a maximum of one (1) year probationary extension for correction of a specified problem to be documented through written materials or through an on-site visit. At the end of the extension, the EPSB shall decide that the documentation supports:~~

- ~~1. Approval; or~~
- ~~2. Denial of approval; or~~

~~(c) Denial of approval, indicating that a serious problem exists which jeopardizes the quality of preparation of school personnel.~~

~~(5) The EPSB shall order a review of a program if it has cause to believe that the quality of preparation is seriously jeopardized. The review shall be conducted under the criteria and procedures established in the EPSB "Emergency Review of Certification Programs Procedure" policy incorporated by reference. The on-site review shall be conducted by EPSB staff and a Board of Examiners team. The review shall result in a report to which the institution may respond. The review report and institutional response shall be used by the Executive Director of the EPSB as the basis for a recommendation to the full EPSB for:~~

- (a) Approval;
- (b) Approval with conditions; or
- (c) Denial of approval for the program.

~~(6) If the EPSB denies approval of a program, the institution shall notify each student currently admitted to that program of the EPSB action. The notice shall include the following information:~~

~~(a) A student recommended for certification or advancement in rank within the twelve (12) months immediately following the denial of state approval and who applies to the EPSB within the fifteen (15) months immediately following the denial of state approval shall receive the certification or advancement in rank; and~~

~~(b) A student who does not meet the criteria established in paragraph (a) of this subsection shall transfer to a state approved program in order to receive the certificate or advancement in rank.]~~

Section 13[23]. Public Disclosure. (1) After an accreditation and~~[a unit or]~~ program approval decision becomes final, the EPSB shall prepare official notice of the action. The disclosure notice shall include the essential information provided in the official letter to the institution, including the decision on accreditation, program approval, standards not met, program areas for improvement, and dates of official action.

(2) The public disclosure shall be entered into the minutes of the EPSB~~[board]~~ for the meeting in which the official action was taken by the EPSB.[]

~~(3) Thirty (30) days after the institution has received official notification of EPSB action, the EPSB shall on request provide a copy of the public disclosure notice to the Kentucky Education Association, the Council on Postsecondary Education, the Association of Independent Kentucky Colleges and Universities or other organizations or individuals.]~~

Section 14[24]. Appeals Process. (1) If an institution seeks appeal of a decision, the institution shall appeal within thirty (30) days of receipt of the EPSB official notification. An institution shall appeal on the grounds that:

- (a) A prescribed standard was disregarded;
- (b) A state procedure was not followed; or

(c) Evidence of compliance in place at the time of the review and favorable to the institution was not considered.

(2) An ad hoc appeals board of no fewer than three (3) members shall be appointed by the EPSB chair from members of the Accreditation Reviewers~~[Board of Examiners]~~ who have not had involvement with the team visit or a conflict of interest regarding the institution. The ad hoc committee shall recommend action on the appeal to the EPSB.

(3) The consideration of the appeal shall be in accordance with KRS Chapter 13B.[]

~~Section 25. Approval of Alternative Route to Certification Programs. (1) Alternative route programs authorized under KRS 161.028(1)(s) or (t) shall adhere to the educator preparation unit accreditation and program approval processes established in this administrative regulation and in the EPSB policy and procedure entitled "Approval of Alternative Route to Certification Program Offered Under KRS 161.028" as a condition of offering an educator certification program or program leading to a rank change.~~

~~(2) The EPSB shall consider a waiver upon request of the institution offering the alternative route program. The request shall be submitted in writing no later than thirty (30) days prior to the next regularly scheduled EPSB meeting. In granting the waiver, the board shall consider~~

~~the provisions of this administrative regulation and any information presented that supports a determination of undue restriction.]~~

Section 15. Interim Reports. (1) Each state accredited EPP shall report to the EPSB in the third year following its previous accreditation visit to provide data about:

1. Progress made in addressing areas for improvement identified by its last accreditation evaluation;

2. Changes in the institution's institutional accreditation status; and

3. Continuous improvement efforts relating to the accreditation standards.

(2)(a) The EPSB staff shall review each EPP's interim report to monitor the progress of the EPP to continue a program of high quality.

(b) The EPSB may pursue action against the EPP based on data received in this report.

Section 16[26]. In compliance with the Federal Title II Report Card State Guidelines established in 20 U.S.C. 1022f and 1022g, the EPSB shall identify an EPP[educator preparation unit] as:

(1) "At-risk of low performing" if an EPP[educator preparation program] has received a:

(a) State accreditation rating of "provisional"; or

(b) State accreditation rating of "accreditation with conditions"; [or]

(c) Summative Praxis II pass rate below 80%;

(d) National accreditation rating of "accreditation with stipulation";

(2) "Low performing" if an EPP[educator preparation program] has received a state or national accreditation rating of "accreditation with probation".

Section 17[27]. The Education Professional Standards Board shall maintain data reports related to the following[~~produce a state report card, which shall include~~]:

(1) Current accreditation status of all institutions with EPSB approved programs;~~[General information on the institution and the educator preparation unit;]~~

(2) Contact information for the person responsible for the EPP[educator preparation unit];

(3) [Type or types of accreditation the unit holds;

(4) Current state accreditation status of the educator preparation unit;

(5)] Year of last state accreditation visit and year of next scheduled visit;

(4)[(6)] Table of the EPP's[unit's] approved certification program or programs;

(5)[(7)] Tables relating the EPP's[unit's] total enrollment disaggregated by ethnicity and gender for the last three (3) years;

(6)[(8)] Tables relating the EPP's[unit's] faculty disaggregated by the number of full-time equivalents (FTE), ethnicity, and gender for the last three (3) years;

(7)[(9)] Table of the number of program completers (teachers and other school professionals[administrators]) for the last three (3) years;

(8)[(10)] Table relating pass rates on the required assessments;

(9)[(11)] Table relating pass rates for the Kentucky Teacher Internship Program (if applicable);

(10)[(12)] Table relating pass rates for the Kentucky Principal Internship Program (if applicable);

(11)[(13)] Table indicating student teacher satisfaction with the preparation program;

(12)[(14)] Table relating teacher intern satisfaction with the preparation program; and

(13)[(15)] Table relating new teacher (under three (3) years) and supervisor satisfaction with the preparation program.

Section 18. Program Review Components for Developmental Process. (1) In order to operate a program leading to certification or rank change, the EPP shall have its program review documents reviewed by the EPSB for each separate program of educator preparation for which the EPP is seeking approval.

(2) The following information must be demonstrated in the program review documentation:

(a) An overview that includes:

1. The context and unique characteristics;
2. Description of the organizational structure;
3. The vision, mission, and goals; and
4. The shared values and beliefs for educator preparation.

(b) A description of its systematic approach for continuous improvement;

(c) A description of its clinical partnerships;

(d) An alignment of the program's coursework and field and clinical experiences with the content standards of the relevant National Specialized Professional Association, student academic expectations as established in 703 KAR 4:060, and relevant state performance standards in Title XVI of the Kentucky Administrative Regulations;

(e) Identification and alignment of the program assessments to the state performance standards to assure each candidate's mastery prior to exit from the program;

(f) Identification of how the program addresses the applicable regulatory requirements of Title XVI of the Kentucky Administrative Regulations;

(g) A list of faculty responsible for and involved with the conduct of the specific program, along with the highest degree of each, qualifications for the program, and status of employment within the program and the university; and

(h) A curriculum guide provided to each candidate that includes the following:

1. Name of the program and resulting certification and rank;
2. Program admission criteria;
3. Program coursework;
4. Program exit requirements;
5. Certification requirements if they differ from the program exit requirements.

Section 19. New Program Approval for an accredited EPP. (1) An accredited EPP shall submit a program proposal for each new educator preparation program.

(2) A program proposal shall demonstrate the following components

(a) A description of its clinical partnerships relevant to the new program;

(b) A description of the application of the EPP's continuous improvement plan as it pertains to the new program;

(c) An alignment of the program's coursework and field and clinical experiences with the content standards of the relevant National Specialized Professional Association, student academic expectations as established in 703 KAR 4:060, and relevant state performance standards in Title XVI of the Kentucky Administrative Regulations;

(d) Identification and alignment of the program assessments to the state performance standards to assure each candidate's mastery prior to exit from the program;

(e) Identification of how the program addresses the applicable regulatory requirements of Title XVI of the Kentucky Administrative Regulations;

(f) A list of faculty responsible for and involved with the conduct of the specific program, along with the highest degree of each, qualifications for the program, and status of employment within the program and the university; and

(g) A curriculum guide provided to each candidate that includes the following:

1. Name of the program and resulting certification and rank;



2. Program admission criteria;

3. Program coursework;

4. Program exit requirements; and

5. Certification requirements if they differ from the program exit requirements.

(3) A program must receive EPSB approval prior to admission of students to the program.

The Program approval decision options shall be:

(a) Approval with the next review scheduled during the regular accreditation cycle;

(b) Approval with conditions with a maximum of one (1) year probationary extension for correction of a specific problem to be documented through written materials or through an onsite visit. At the end of the extension, the EPSB shall decide if the documentation supports:

1. Approval; or

2. Denial.

(c) Denial approval indicating that a serious problem exists which jeopardizes the quality of preparation for school personnel.

Section 20. Continuing Program Approval. (1) EPPs that have been granted approval for each of educator preparation programs, shall submit the following for each educator preparation program for which it seeks continuing approval:

(a) Report of any changes in the program since the last EPSB review;

(b) Summary analysis of the program assessment data to identify areas of strength and weakness relevant to the educator performance standards;

(c) Description of the program's continuous improvement plan based on the program analysis.

(2) The EPSB shall order a review of an educator preparation program if it has cause to believe that the quality of the preparation is seriously jeopardized.

(a) The review shall be conducted under the criteria and procedures established in the EPSB "Emergency Review of Certification Programs Procedure" policy incorporated by reference.

(b) Phase One Review shall require a written report about the identified program(s) and the continuous improvement plans.

(c) The Phase Two Review shall require an on-site review to be conducted by EPSB staff and a team of trained reviewers.

(d) The review shall result in a report to which the EPP may respond.

(e) The review report and EPP response shall be used by the Program Review Committee as the basis for a recommendation to the full EPSB for:

1. Approval;

2. Approval with conditions; or

3. Denial of approval for the program.

(f) If the EPSB denies approval of a program, the EPP shall notify each candidate currently admitted to that program of the EPSB action. The notice shall include the following information:

1. A candidate recommended for certification or advancement in rank within the twelve (12) months immediately following the denial of state approval and who applies to the EPSB within the fifteen (15) months immediately following the denial of state approval shall receive the certification or advancement in rank; and

2. A candidate who does not meet the criteria established in subparagraph 1. of this paragraph shall transfer to an EPSB approved program to receive the certificate or advancement in rank.

Section 21. Content Review Committee. (1)(a) EPSB staff shall identify and train a content review committee in each of the certificate areas to provide content area expertise to EPSB staff and the Program Review Committee.

(b) Nominations for the content review committees shall be solicited from the education constituent groups.

(2)(a) A content review committee shall review all new educator preparation program proposals to establish congruence of the program with standards of National Specialized Professional Association and appropriate state performance standards in Title XVI of the Kentucky Administrative Regulations.

(b) EPSB staff may initiate a content review committee for a continuing approval review as determined by program changes that may have occurred since the last review.

(3) A content review committee shall submit written comments to EPSB staff and the Program Review Committee for use in the program review process.

(4) A content review committee shall not make any determination or decision regarding the approval or denial of a program.

Section 22. Program Review Committee. (1) The EPSB shall appoint and EPSB staff shall train a Program Review Committee representative of the constituent groups to the EPSB.

(2) The Program Review Committee shall conduct a preliminary review of the Development Process Stage One documentation for adequacy, timeliness, and conformity with the corresponding standards and Kentucky Administrative Regulations.

(3) The Program Review Committee shall send a Program Review Update to the Stage One applicants indicating whether the documentation satisfies the submission requirements. If a requirement has not been met, the applicant shall be asked to revise or send additional documentation.

(4) For new program approval, the Program Review Committee shall:

(a) Determine that the submitted material meets requirements;

(b) Ask EPSB staff to resolve with the EPP a discrepancy or omission in the report or programs;

(c) Make a recommendation for program approval to the EPSB; or

(d) Recommend that the evaluation and approval process be terminated as a result of a severe deficiency in the program.

(5) For continuing program approval, the Program Review Committee shall:

(a) Determine that the submitted material meets requirements;

(b) Identify additional components of the program to be reviewed;

(c) Ask EPSB staff to resolve with the EPP a discrepancy or omission in the report or programs;

(d) Refer an unresolved discrepancy or omission to the on-site accreditation team for resolution; or

(e) Recommend that the evaluation and approval process be terminated as a result of a severe deficiency in the program.

(6) EPSB staff shall discuss a recommendation for termination with the EPP. The EPP may submit a written response that shall be presented with the Program Review Committee comments and program review documents to the full EPSB.

Section 23[28]. Approval of Off-site and [On-line] Programs. (1) Institutions in Kentucky with educator preparation programs shall seek approval from the EPSB[Education Professional Standards Board] before offering courses or whole programs at an off-campus site.

(a) The institution shall submit a written request to the EPSB[board] to begin offering courses at the off-site location describing the location and physical attributes of the off-campus site, resources to be provided, faculty and their qualifications, and a list of courses or programs to be offered.

(b) The off-site location shall be approved by the EPSB[board] before the institution may begin offering courses at the location.[]

~~(2)(a) Until May 31, 2008, initial and continuing on-line educator preparation programs shall be regionally or nationally accredited and accredited or approved, as applicable, by the program's state of origin.~~

~~(b) Beginning June 1, 2008, initial and continuing on-line educator preparation programs originating from outside Kentucky shall be regionally accredited, accredited or approved, as applicable, by the program's state of origin, and accredited by NCATE.]~~

Section 24[29]. Incorporation by Reference. (1) The following material is incorporated by reference:

(a) "2022 CAEP Initial Level Standards", December 2020;

(b) "CAEP Standards for Accreditation at the Advanced Level", June 2021; and[]

~~(a) "Professional Standards for the Accreditation of Teacher Preparation Institutions", 2008 Edition, National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education;~~

~~(b) "Education Professional Standards Board Accreditation of Preparation Programs Procedure", August 2002;~~

~~(c) "Education Professional Standards Board Approval of Alternative Route to Certification Program Offered under KRS 161.028", August 2002;]~~

~~(c)[(d)] "Education Professional Standards Board Emergency Review of Certification Programs Procedure", 2020.[September 2003;~~

~~(e) "Kentucky's Safety Educator Standards for Preparation and Certification", May 2004;~~

~~(f) "National Association of School Psychologists, Standards for School Psychology Training Programs, Field Placement Programs, Credentialing Standards", July 2000; and~~

~~(g) "Kentucky's Standards for Guidance Counseling Programs" derived from the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Education Programs (CACREP) Standards, Education Professional Standards Board, November 2004.]~~

(2) This material may be inspected, copied, or obtained, subject to applicable copyright law, at the Kentucky Department of Education, 300 Sower Boulevard, 5th Floor, [Education Professional Standards Board, 100 Airport Road, 3rd Floor,] Frankfort, Kentucky 40601, Monday through Friday, 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.

LISA RUDZINSKI, Board Chair

APPROVED BY AGENCY: June 24, 2021

FILED WITH LRC: July 14, 2021 at 3:58 p.m.

PUBLIC HEARING AND PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: A public hearing on this proposed administrative regulation shall be held on September 23, 2021, at 10:00 a.m. in the State Board Room, Fifth Floor, 300 Sower Boulevard, Frankfort, Kentucky. Individuals interested in being heard at this meeting shall notify this agency in writing five working days prior to the hearing, of their intent to attend. If no notification of intent to attend the hearing is received by that date, the hearing may be canceled. This hearing is open to the public. Any person who wishes to be heard will be given an opportunity to comment on the proposed administrative regulation. A transcript of the public hearing will not be made unless a written request for a transcript is made. If you do not wish to be heard at the public hearing, you may submit written comments on the proposed administrative regulation. Written comments shall be accepted through September 30, 2021. Send writ-

ten notification of intent to be heard at the public hearing or written comments on the proposed administrative regulation to:

CONTACT PERSON: Todd Allen, General Counsel, Kentucky Department of Education, 300 Sower Boulevard, 5th Floor, Frankfort, Kentucky 40601, phone 502-564-4474, fax 502-564-9321; email regcomments@education.ky.gov

## REGULATORY IMPACT ANALYSIS AND TIERING STATEMENT

Contact Person: Todd Allen

(1) Provide a brief summary of:

(a) What this administrative regulation does: This administrative regulation establishes the standards for accreditation of an educator preparation provider and approval of a program to prepare an educator.

(b) The necessity of this administrative regulation: This administrative regulation is necessary to set the standards for accreditation of an educator preparation provider and approval of a program to prepare an educator for certification.

(c) How this administrative regulation conforms to the content of the authorizing statutes: KRS 161.028 requires the Education Professional Standards Board to establish standards for and approve programs for the preparation of teachers and other professional school personnel.

(d) How this administrative regulation currently assists or will assist in the effective administration of the statutes: This administrative regulation delineates the requirements for accreditation of an educator preparation provider and approval of a program to prepare an educator.

(2) If this is an amendment to an existing administrative regulation, provide a brief summary of:

(a) How the amendment will change this existing administrative regulation: This amendment creates the option for an educator preparation provider to pursue state-only or national accreditation. It updates the standards for state-only accreditation and the procedures for approval of an educator preparation program.

(b) The necessity of the amendment to this administrative regulation: The amendment is necessary to allow educator preparation providers options in pursuing accreditation. It is also necessary to update the standards for accreditation of a provider and the procedures for approval of a program for preparation of an educator.

(c) How the amendment conforms to the content of the authorizing statutes: KRS 161.028(1) authorizes the Education Professional Standards Board to set the standards for and approve programs for the preparation of teachers and other professional school personnel. This amendment updates those standards and procedures.

(d) How the amendment will assist in the effective administration of the statutes: The amendment updates the standards used for state-only accreditation to nationally recognized standards for the accreditation of educator preparation and allows educator preparation providers the opportunity to seek accreditation from an approved national accreditor who meets the requirements of KRS 161.028(1)(b). The amendment also updates the procedures for approval of programs for the preparation of an educator.

(3) List the type and number of individuals, businesses, organizations, or state and local governments affected by this administrative regulation: 30 educator preparation program providers and any providers seeking future accreditation and approval for an educator preparation program

(4) Provide an analysis of how the entities identified in question (3) will be impacted by either the implementation of this administrative regulation, if new, or by the change, if it is an amendment, including:

(a) List the actions that each of the regulated entities identified in question (3) will have to take to comply with this administrative regulation or amendment: Educator preparation providers will have to meet the standards outlined in the amendment for accreditation of the provider and approval of the programs to prepare an educator.

(b) In complying with this administrative regulation or amendment, how much will it cost each of the entities identified in question (3): There is no fee created by this amendment. Complying with the standards for accreditation and program approval will require the expenditure of educator preparation provider staff time and resources. There is not a fee for state accreditation or program approval. If the educator preparation provider chooses to pursue national accreditation, there may be a fee set by the national accreditor.

(c) As a result of compliance, what benefits will accrue to the entities identified in question (3): Providers will benefit from the option to pursue state accreditation or national accreditation by an accreditor approved by the Education Professional Standards Board. Compliance will result in the provider being accredited for educator preparation and the programs being approved for certification.

(5) Provide an estimate of how much it will cost the administrative body to implement this administrative regulation:

(a) Initially: There will be some costs associated with training staff and reviewers on the updated standards and procedures for accreditation and program approval. These costs are expected to be minimal.

(b) On a continuing basis: On-going costs will be staff for accreditation and program approval. Staff are already employed and assigned to these roles, so there are no additional costs associated with the amendment.

(6) What is the source of the funding to be used for the implementation and enforcement of this administrative regulation: State General Fund.

(7) Provide an assessment of whether an increase in fees or funding will be necessary to implement this administrative regulation, if new, or by the change if it is an amendment: No increase in fees or funding will be necessary to implement this amendment.

(8) State whether or not this administrative regulation established any fees or directly or indirectly increased any fees: Certification fees are established by 16 KAR 4:040. There is no fee for state accreditation or program approval. There may be a fee if the provider pursues national accreditation; however, that fee would be set by the national accreditor. No additional fees are established by this regulation.

(9) TIERING: Is tiering applied? Tiering is not applicable to the requirements of this regulation.

## FISCAL NOTE ON STATE OR LOCAL GOVERNMENT

(1) What units, parts, or divisions of state or local government (including cities, counties, fire departments, or school districts) will be impacted by this administrative regulation? The Education Professional Standards Board, public colleges and universities with educator preparation programs and public-school districts.

(2) Identify each state or federal statute or federal regulation that requires or authorizes the action taken by the administrative regulation. KRS 161.020, KRS 161.028, KRS 161.030.

(3) Estimate the effect of this administrative regulation on the expenditures and revenues of a state or local government agency (including cities, counties, fire departments, or school districts) for the first full year the administrative regulation is to be in effect.

(a) How much revenue will this administrative regulation generate for the state or local government (including cities, counties, fire departments, or school districts) for the first year? There will be no additional revenues created by this amendment.

(b) How much revenue will this administrative regulation generate for the state or local government (including cities, counties, fire departments, or school districts) for subsequent years? There will be no additional revenues created by this amendment.

(c) How much will it cost to administer this program for the first year? There will be some costs associated with training staff and reviewers on the updated standards and procedures for accreditation and program approval. These costs are expected to be minimal.

(d) How much will it cost to administer this program for subsequent years? On-going costs will be staff for accreditation and program approval. Staff are already employed and assigned to these roles, so there are no additional costs associated with the amendment.

Note: If specific dollar estimates cannot be determined, provide a brief narrative to explain the fiscal impact of the administrative regulation.

Revenues (+/-):

Expenditures (+/-):

Other Explanation: This is not a fee generating program but, rather, establishes the standards for accreditation and the approval of programs for the preparation of teachers and other professional school personnel.